

Democratic Republican Nominations.

FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
GEN. J. W. CASS.  
OF MICHIGAN.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HON. WM. O. BUTLER.  
OF KENTUCKY.

Democratic Electoral Ticket.

1st District, THOMAS BRAGG, Jr., of Northampton.  
2d " ASA BIGGS, of Marlborough.  
3d " PETER HUBBARD, of Wake.  
4th " GEORGE S. STEVENSON, of Craven.  
5th " WILLIAM S. ASHIE, of New Hanover.  
6th " SAMUEL J. PETERSON, of Moore.  
7th " CADWALLADER JONES, Sr., of Orange.  
8th " JUNIUS L. CLEMMONS, of Davidson.  
9th " GREEN W. CALDWELL, of Mecklenburg.  
10th " W. AVERY, of Burke.  
11th " JESSE R. WEAVER.

11th Election on Tuesday, 7th November.—Ed

See fourth page.

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

We are requested by a number of Democrats, to give notice, that a meeting of the Democratic party of New Hanover county will be held at the Court-House, in this town, on Tuesday night of our next Superior Court. Come one, come all. Let us have a grand turn out.—Several gentlemen will address the meeting.

DEMOCRATIC MEETING.

We are requested to state that there will be a Democratic meeting, at the house of Mr. Jesse Farrow, on Masonboro' Sound, on Saturday the 28th inst. All who are desirous of hearing the political questions of the day discussed, are invited to attend. The Whigs are particularly invited to come and see what will be said and done.

3rd Capt. Gaston Meares, of the 9th Regiment of Volunteers, and who distinguished himself so much in the campaign of the Rio Grande, arrived in this place, of which he is a native, on Saturday last, on a visit to his relatives.

BANK DIRECTORS.—We learn that Wm. C. Bettencourt and Wm. A. Wright, Esqs., have been elected Directors of the Bank of Cape Fear, to fill vacancies occasioned by the deaths of Gabriel Holmes and Samuel Shuter, Esqs.

BLADEN.—We received at too late an hour for insertion in this number of the Journal, the interesting proceedings of a Democratic meeting, held at Elizabethtown, on the 12th inst. The meeting was addressed by ISAAC WRIGHT, and DAVID REID, Esqs. The proceedings shall appear in our next.

THE NORTH CAROLINA DEMOCRAT.—The "Hillsboro' Ratoom" has changed its name. It is now the "North Carolina Democrat," and under the auspices of the talented and gallant young BAILY, is doing noble service in the cause of Democracy.

THE NICHOLSON LETTER.

As the great day of battle is rapidly approaching, we have thought it would not be amiss again to re-publish the letter written by our candidate for the Presidency to Mr. Nicholson, of Tennessee, on the subject of the Wilmot Proviso, as it is technically called. This letter was written by Gen. Cass in December last, and explains clearly and at length the views of the distinguished author on the subject of slavery in the Territories. We hope that every Democratic reader of the Journal will give it a careful perusal, and not only do this, but let his Whig neighbors and friends have a peep at it too. This able letter, of itself, is a direct and triumphant answer to all the miserable falsehoods and slanders that are put forth by the Taylor papers and orators. How different the course pursued by General Taylor on this subject. He has written almost an octavo volume of letters for the public eye, and still on this most important question he has not been pleased to say one single word that might enlighten the public mind as to his views upon it, if we except the famous Signal letter, in which he says he goes for the extension of the ordinance of 1787 over every new Territory that we may acquire west of the Rio Grande, and also the famous declaration in his Allison Letter No. 1, where he says, "The personal opinions of the individual who may happen to occupy the Executive Chair ought not to control the action of Congress on questions of domestic policy;" all of which is paraded by his advocates in the North as evidence that the old General is opposed to the extension of slavery—or, at least, is solemnly pledged, by the above declaration, not to interpose his veto should Congress pass any bill or bills excluding slavery from New Mexico and California. See how different is the course of Gen. Cass, the citizen of a free State. He, like a good Republican, holding the doctrine that the people have a right to know the opinions of those who are candidates for popular favor, comes out and boldly avows his opinions on this most delicate and important question. He has no concealments on this or any other subject.

Gen. Cass says, distinctly and emphatically, that the constitution does not give to Congress any power or authority to interfere with this question of slavery in the Territories—that the people should and ought to be permitted to settle this question themselves. What more can the South ask than this? What more can any man, whether North or South, who reveres and regards the guarantees of the constitution, desire than to see the principles of Gen. Cass, as laid down in this able letter, carried out? Surely nothing. And still there are demagogues who will tell you that Gen. Cass is tainted with Abolitionism! Whenever one of this kind of cattle commences bawling, just stop his mouth with this letter, in which Gen. Cass deliberately lays down his views on the slavery question.

Again, we say, be sure you read the letter itself carefully and keep it by you.

THE RECENT ELECTIONS.

The federal papers are trying hard to whistle up their courage on the result in Pennsylvania. For our own part, we do not see a single thing in the result in any State election that has come off since the Presidential nominations, either to cheer the feds, or to dampen the spirits of the democrats. We feel now more certain of the election of Cass and Butler than we have done since the beginning of the campaign. The result in Pennsylvania is such as to convince us, from the reasons given elsewhere, that the State will vote for Cass by at least 4 or 5000 majority. But what think the feds of the result in Ohio? Is there any thing cheering in that for them? We throw not.

DEMOCRATS OF EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA!

We know that we have appealed to you before—we know that, in our humble way, we have endeavored to show you, that upon your exertions the fate of the State will hang on the 7th of November next. We know all this. Still, we hope you will not get angry with us for again endeavoring to stir you up. If you do, we can't help it. We mean to do our duty at any rate. We mean to talk plainly. We don't mean to be mealy-mouthed in the least.

In the first place, we would speak of our own immediate Congressional District. In it, in the aggregate in August last, we gained just 19 votes over the vote we gave Hoke in 1844, whilst the gallant Democracy of the State elsewhere gained 2299 on that vote. It is needless to ask now, why was this? Some of the counties composing the district, did nobly, whilst others behaved—how shall we say?—mightily badly? We speak plainly, because we have every reason to believe that the gallant Democrats of these counties feel this matter as keenly as we or any other Democrat can; and because we believe further, that they are determined, in November, to make up for the past. We think we can say so for New-Hanover at least. But we will say no more about this. We feel assured that both our immediate Electoral and Congressional Districts will do their whole duty in November.

We have reflected on the probable issue of the coming election in North Carolina a great deal, and the more we think upon the matter, the more we become convinced that we can carry the State for Cass and Butler, if we will only try. We have, within the last few days, seen a letter from one of the best informed politicians in the West, in which he says that Cass and Butler will gain upon Reid's vote on the whole in Western North Carolina, some 600 or 700 votes. Of this he feels certain.—In the same letter, he says that everything depends upon the heavy Eastern Democratic counties. He says if they will only muster their whole strength—go it with a rush—there can be no doubt but that we will carry the State triumphantly for Cass and Butler. We will add that this is our own solemn conviction. We believe as firmly as we do that we are penning these lines, that if every Democrat in Eastern North Carolina will go to the polls, on the 7th of November next, we can carry the State by a handsome majority. We have repeatedly heard intelligent democrats from different counties in Eastern North Carolina say, since the August election, that they were convinced that Democrats could never win near the polls to have elected Col. Reid. Is this not shameful? Is it not scandalous? We have no patience with democrats who are either so lazy or so lukewarm as to remain at home on the day of election. It is true there was something of a plausible excuse which a democrat to whom it would work some inconvenience to go to the election in August last, might render. He might very well say that the contest was a hopeless one—that we had been beaten so often, it was no use in trying—that there was no use in his putting himself to an inconvenience, when his vote would do no good. Now, this is "plausible, but not strength." We hold that it is the sacred duty of a democrat on all occasions, and under all circumstances, to record his vote in favor of his principles. But there will be no such excuse, however weak, in November, for the democrat who fails to perform his duty to himself and to his principles. The August election shows plainly that the State would have elected Reid, if all the democratic votes there had been polled. We have every reason to believe that Cass and Butler are stronger in the State than Col. Reid was in August; and we know that the abolitionism of Fillmore will deter many whigs from voting the ticket on which his name appears as the candidate for the Vice Presidency. In fact, we have every reason to believe that we can easily overcome the paltry majority (854) by which Mr. Manly was elected. What, then, could we think, or say of the democrat who will not go to the polls on the 7th of November next? Under all the circumstances, would such a man be worthy the name of a democrat? We appeal to yourselves, brother democrats, for an answer to this question.

We conjure you, then, brother democrats of Eastern North Carolina, to work like men who have a good cause—a cause that is dear to your hearts. We conjure you to work like men who have every reason to believe that your labors will be crowned with success.—And what a glorious consummation it would be to redeem the good old North State from federal thralldom? Where is the democrat worthy the name, who would not be willing to work—yes, to work with a heart and a will—for so glorious a consummation?

We call upon those democrats whose circumstances afford them more time and leisure than their less fortunate brethren, to exert themselves to see that every democratic vote is brought to the polls. Let those whose age or infirmities will not enable them to get there, be provided with conveyances. The result may turn upon a few votes, and how mean would those feel, who, if they had chosen to exert themselves, could have carried those few votes to the polls? But we have talked long enough in this strain! We have spoken freely. We feel deeply in the matter, and must say what we think.

Brethren, we have everything to cheer us on in the glorious work. If we are not very much misinformed, the whig Quakers of Western North Carolina will not vote for a military chieftain, fresh from the encrimsoned field of war, unrecommended by any civil qualification. Gentlemen who ought to know, give us this information. Again; there are many whigs who would vote for Taylor, but who cannot be persuaded to swallow his abolition tail, Fillmore. Our friends everywhere throughout the State, are in the best of spirits. In a word, if we of the East will only make one long, strong pull—a pull altogether—there is no earthly doubt but that we can carry the State. Will we not do it? We think we hear every good democrat answer, Yes, we will with our whole hearts and souls.

3rd We would reply to the Chronicle's paragraph about the extra pay of Cass and Taylor, by asserting that Gen. Cass never received a dollar from the public Treasury that he was not as justly and as legally entitled to as was Gen. Taylor to the various extra items that he received, and we call upon the Chronicle to put its finger upon a single dollar that Gen. Cass ever received from the government that he was not justly and equitably entitled to.

THE VETO—"THE ONE-MAN POWER." If there be one feature in the Constitution more than another—the destruction of which we would, as a democrat, deprecate—it is the veto power as it now exists in that instrument. It does not surprise us much, that the present whig party, which so faithfully represents the old federal party, should be opposed to this truly States' Right conservative feature; a feature that preserves the balance between the States so essentially, that if it is once abolished, there is no telling what oppressions the stronger section of the Union might impose upon us of the South, who are decidedly the weaker. The whigs are fond of calling this—the most republican and conservative feature in the constitution—"the one man power." No doubt it has thwarted some of their mad, nefarious schemes; but has not the whole country been the gainer?

To adopt the language of an able contemporary, we ask, shall the constitution of our country be mutilated? Shall the instrument, framed by the wisdom of Washington, Madison, Jay, Hamilton, Morris, and the other conscript fathers of the republic, and under which we have gone on in a state of national prosperity unexampled, be now broken in pieces, and one of its main elements abstracted, to gratify the whim of a mere soldier, who admits himself, that he has none of the experience or attainments of a statesman; who never exercised a civil function in his life; and who is profoundly ignorant, by his own confession, of even the current political measures of legislation? Shall the great popular power—the check-and-balance wheel between the States in the Senate and the "federal ratio" in the House—be torn away, and those two bodies organized upon different basis of representation—be left to discordant and unharmonizing action? The proposition is most alarming, and pregnant with mischief? The architects of ruin are always ready to tear down; but can they erect a better edifice from the fragments of their destruction?

"A thousand years scarce serve to build a state; A single hour may lay it in the dust." Let the people pause about this proposition. Let them reflect what will be the result of introducing Gen. Taylor's only avowed principle—the ABOLITION OF THE VETO—into our national legislation. Will the great machinery of our government, which has found so often its preservation in the exercise of this power, continue to move on steadily when it is gone? Or will it not rather, like a watch whose main spring is broken, run down with noise and violence and confusion? We would advise all who would act with judgment and discretion upon this subject, to consult the able papers of "The Federalist," and the sound and deliberate views of Story and Kent in their Commentaries on the Constitution, upon the importance and indispensable necessity of this power. Those opinions were given by men who were statesmen and constitutional jurists, and who had devoted their lives to the investigation of the principle of government. If they would hesitate to lay the hand of Dagon on the ark of our national covenant, what blindness and infatuation must it be for a rough and inexperienced soldier to attempt to carve out, as with the sword, one of its most vital and delicate portions! Truly we might apply to the wreckless followers of Gen. Taylor, in this attack upon the constitution, the old quotation that—

"Fools blunder in where angels fear to tread."

MR. WEBSTER AND "FREE SOIL."

In former numbers of this paper, we have given extract upon extract from the columns of leading Taylor papers published in the free States; and from the speeches of the most distinguished leaders of the whig party in the whole of the free States, to prove that the whole whig party north are "free soilers." We have also shown that Gen. Taylor is supported by that party upon the ground that he is openly and unequivocally pledged, by his written letters, not to interfere with the action of Congress in any shape or manner, should it see fit to pass an act prohibiting the introduction of slavery into California and New Mexico. We quoted the remarks some weeks since, made by Daniel Webster, the great New England Federalist leader, in his speech made at Marshfield, Mass., in which he declared it as his solemn conviction, that if, on the one hand, Gen. Cass would be elected, the Territorial question would be settled on the basis of the Missouri Compromise; but if, on the other hand, Gen. Taylor was elected, then this great question would be settled in accordance with the wishes of the great northern whig party, who, Mr. Webster took occasion to say, had better and juster claims to the title of genuine free soil men than the Van Burenites. Since this Marshfield speech, Mr. Webster has again thought proper to address his brother whigs of Plymouth county, Mass., in which, in still bolder and more direct language, he declares that the "free soil" doctrine "was an old but living doctrine of the whig party." And we will quote a paragraph from this last effort of the "God like Daniel" for the benefit of our Southern readers:

"Mr. Webster, in reference to the Free Soil organization, said that their great ostensible principle was an old but living doctrine of the whig party; and if all whigs were now abandoning a legitimate principle of their own faith for the same article in another creed, to go over to the Buffalo ticket, instead of doing their manifest duty by voting for Gen. Taylor, they would not only make a change of name, but would enact the unparalleled monstrosity of placing Martin Van Buren at the head of the great whig party!"

Can there remain a doubt on the mind of any sane man, that the Northern supporters of Gen. Taylor are, every one of them, avowed free soil men? just as much so as the followers of Van Buren and Adams? And still, with all this standing them in the face, we find Southern men pulling with them in the same traces, without requiring the slightest intimation from Gen. Taylor of his views on this important question!

ORANGE COUNTY.

Mr. WADDELL, whig, whom the Sheriff of Orange had proclaimed the Senator elect, when in truth, Mr. BERRY, his opponent, had received a clear majority of the votes of the Freeholders of the county, has resigned his seat (?) and the Governor has ordered a new election, to take place on the 7th November. We find in the last Standard, Mr. BERRY's address to the Freeholders of the county, in which he says that he, too, is perfectly willing that they should decide between himself and Mr. WADDELL. We have no sort of doubt but that Mr. BERRY will be elected; and if he is, this will make a tie in the Senate, as well as in the House of Commons. Close work.

SENATOR BUTLER, OF S. C. FOR CASS AND BUTLER.

It will be recollected that when the two South Carolina Senators returned to Charleston, after the close of the late session of Congress, they addressed the citizens of that place. Neither of the distinguished gentlemen at that time declared to which of the Presidential candidates they inclined. Since then, however, on the 2d of this month, Gen. Butler addressed the citizens of Edgefield District. We find a report of his speech in the Charleston Mercury of Monday last, from which we clip the following extract. It shows that Gen. Butler is now for Cass.—

Gen. Cass (said Gen. Butler) is to be preferred to Gen. Taylor as he is the organ of the Democratic party. It is to this party the South must look for assistance;—if, indeed, she is to expect any aid North of Mason's and Dixon's line. We have, it is true, friends at the North; men who would cheerfully aid us in establishing our rights if they did not fear to provoke the indignation of their constituency; but so strong is the force of public opinion at the North on the subject of slavery, that the members of Congress from that section dare not yield a point, without they do it under the pretext of a compromise.

ANOTHER SLANDER—"NAMED TO THE COUNTER."—The last Union publishes the amplest and most convincing evidence, (sworn to), that the statement made by the *Intelligencer*, and copied into all the small fry of federal papers, about the Washington Penitentiary being converted into a Democratic electioneering machine, is utterly false. It turns out to be a base slander—the whole—from beginning to end.

TOM CORWIN'S VIEW OF GEN. TAYLOR'S NORTHERN FACE.

The following is an extract taken from a speech made by the great Taylor leader and orator of Ohio, Hon. Thomas Corwin, at New Carthage, and published in the National Intelligencer of the 11th inst. It shows plainly that the greatest efforts are being made by the Whig leaders in the free States, to convince the people that Gen. Taylor is pledged not to veto the Wilmot Proviso. What do Southern Whigs think of this double game?

I have heard, for instance, that it has been reported in Hamilton county that, upon a certain occasion, in speaking of Gen. Taylor's peculiar position in regard to the slavery question, I had said "he would necessarily deceive somebody." [A laugh.] No doubt it so struck the gentleman who made report while I was endeavoring to show to an audience of our northern brethren that Gen. Taylor occupied such a position in relation to the veto power that he could not, consistently with his public knowledge of the facts, put that into a bill providing for the exclusion of slavery in these new territories of ours. I was asked the question, if I did not believe that some gentlemen who supported him in the South expected that he would? I said I did not know; that I dare say they did. "Well," said the party, "will not the North or the South be deceived?" I replied that anybody who believed he would vote such a bill would be deceived. Well, I perceive that this is in great danger of creating a revolution in Hamilton county, (laughter,) my opinion about somebody being deceived.

GARBLING.

The federal papers of North Carolina and other Southern States, publish a garbled extract from Gen. Cass's pamphlet on the Right of Search, written when he was our Minister to the Court of France, to prove that he is an abolitionist. These papers generally publish the extract in this way:

"WE ARE NO SLAVEHOLDER—WE NEVER HAVE BEEN—WE NEVER SHALL BE. WE DEPRECATE ITS EXISTENCE AND PRAY FOR ITS ABOLITION EVERY WHERE."

They stop right in the middle of a sentence. It seems to us that the federal press has lost all sense of fair dealing and evenhanded justice. We shall give the whole passage, and let the reader judge if there is anything in it that would induce the belief that Lewis Cass is an abolitionist. We, for one, are perfectly willing that every man, woman and child in the South should see everything that Lewis Cass has ever written or spoken; but we do protest against the garbling of federal newspapers. The following is the whole extract alluded to:

"We are no slaveholder—we never have been—we never shall be. We deprecate its existence, and pray for its abolition every where WHERE THIS CAN BE EFFECTED JUSTLY, AND FAIRLY, AND EASILY FOR BOTH PARTIES. But we would not carry fire, and devastation, and murder, and ruin into a peaceful community to push on the accomplishment of the object. But, after having visited the three quarters of the old continent, we say before God and the world, that we have seen far more and more frightful misery since we landed in Europe, and we have not visited Ireland yet, than we have ever seen among this class of people in the United States. Whatever may be said, there is much of the patriarchal relation between the Southern planter and his slave, and with the physical distress which is seen in Europe, resulting from a want of food, and from exposure to a rigorous winter without adequate clothing, we believe it to be so rare as not to form a just element in the consideration of this matter. But the subject of the emancipation of two millions and a half of human beings, living among another population of different race and color, and with different habits and feelings, is one of the gravest questions which can be submitted to Society to solve. It can safely be left only to those who are to be seriously affected by it; and there it is left by the Constitution of the United States. IT IS A MATTER WITH WHICH THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT HAS NO CONCERN."

P. S. Since preparing the above, we find in the *Chronicle* of Wednesday the first two sentences of the above extract quoted, to prove Gen. Cass an abolitionist. Why did not the *Chronicle* quote the whole of what Gen. Cass says on the subject of slavery in this connection. The *Chronicle* ought to know that it is a rule of evidence, and a rule of fair dealing, to give the whole, and not a part of what a man says about any matter, when it is intended to be adduced against him.

PENNSYLVANIA.

We don't often quote from Free Soil papers, but the following paragraph seems so appropos to the explanation of the present state of political affairs in the old Keystone State, that we cannot refrain from giving it to our readers. It is taken from the Philadelphia Republic, the organ of the Free Soil party in the State:—

Pennsylvania has elected ZACHARY TAYLOR President of the United States—nothing now remains but to fulfill the forms of an election on the 7th day of November.—*North American*. A little too fast, neighbor! A victory for Wm. F. Johnston, an avowed friend of Free Soil, is not exactly the same thing as a victory for Old Zack, the hero of an unequalled and atrocious war, the Louisiana planter and the owner of three hundred slaves.—Johnston received the votes of thousands who would sooner submit to martyrdom than bestow their suffrages upon a warrior and a slaveholder. The Free Soil party, which, for very satisfactory reasons did not enter into the State canvass, will be found in the field on the 7th of November.

THE MUM CANDIDATE.

"I say again, fellow-citizens, remember the fate of ancient Rome, and vote for no candidate who will not tell you, with the frankness of an independent freeman, the principles upon which, if elected, he will administer your government."

"That man deserves to be a slave who would vote for a MUM CANDIDATE, whose liberty is at stake."—A free man who values his right to vote for such a man, when his opinion is asked for, insults you with the reply:—"I will answer no questions, coming either from friend or foe!" I answer FOR YOU, that none worthy to be free can do so."

The above eloquent sentences are from the pen of the immortal JACKSON, and ought to be engraven upon the heart of every free man in America. How peculiarly applicable are they to the present moment. Gen. Taylor is now the candidate of one of the great political parties of this country for the first civil office in its gift; the day of election is rapidly approaching, and yet there is not a single man in the Union, a "friend or foe" of Gen. Taylor, who can even guess, from anything that the General has ever said or written, upon what "principles, if elected, he will administer the government." Can any Whig or any Democrat say, if Gen. Taylor is elected, whether he will recommend a change in the Tariff policy of the country? Can any one say whether, if elected, he will recommend the abolition of the Independent Treasury system, and a return to the old exploded United States Bank idea? Who, we can tell how Gen. Taylor actually feels and thinks on these great and vital national questions? And still the free voters of America are called upon to vote for a man who utterly refuses to disclose his views on these points. Why, it is grossly insulting to the intelligence of the whole American people. Gen. Jackson said, in his own strong nervous language, "That man deserves to be a slave who would vote for a MUM CANDIDATE, when his liberty is at stake," and we fully agree with him. It is entirely too important a matter upon which to take any man on trust.

CAN THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA, A SLAVE STATE, VOTE THE TICKET MADE UP FOR THEM BY THE FEDERAL WIRE-PULLERS?

We ask, Can the people of North Carolina, consistently with their interest and their honor, vote for Zachary Taylor and Millard Fillmore? The first named gentleman has not thought proper so far to condescend as to let the people, whose destinies he is seeking to wield, know one word as to his views on all those great questions of national policy which have divided men's opinions ever since the commencement of the present century.—Can the people—can the independent citizens of a free republic—consistently with their honor and their interest, vote for a man whose watchword is MUM, when asked for his opinions on questions of vital importance to every man in the country? Will they permit any man to treat them with so little respect as not to let them know what his opinions are, and still vote for him? Surely the freemen of North Carolina will have more self-respect than to do this. Can even the Whig party have any respect for a man who has been fishing about for the support of the odds and ends of all the petty political factions in the country; who was perfectly willing to have accepted the nomination of the Democratic Baltimore Convention, had it been tendered to him on the same terms as was the nomination of the Philadelphia Whig Convention. But even if they can find it in their consciences to vote for Zachary Taylor, how, in the name of common sense, can they vote for Millard Fillmore, who is undoubtedly a rank Abolitionist? Can the people of North Carolina—citizens of a slave State—vote for a man who, in every act of his whole life, when the opportunity offered, voted and wrote against the dearest interests of the South? How can they, with clear consciences, lend their helping hands to place in the second office in the Republic a man whose every act proves his hostility to the South? A man who voted against the Atherton resolutions, that were introduced into the House of Representatives for the purpose of declaring the sense of that body on the rights of the South—who wrote the letter published in another column, which embodies all that the most rabid Abolitionists have ever desired or claimed. How, we ask, in the name of common sense, can Southern men be so demoted as to vote for such a man; especially when it is considered that he, as the President of the United States Senate, will have the casting vote between the North and the South; the slave and non-slaveholding States being tied in that body. Does any man dream for a moment but that he would give that casting vote for the North, should the Wilmot Proviso or any similar anti-Southern question come up? Surely there can be no one so blind as to have any doubts on this matter. But we ask the question again:—How can Southern men reconcile it with their consciences to vote for an Abolitionist for so important a trust? We cannot believe that they will do it. We cannot believe that the slaveholders of North Carolina will be so far blinded by partisan feeling as to support their deadliest enemy. We feel sure that there are many Whigs who cannot and will not vote for Millard Fillmore. For the life of us, we cannot see how ANY Southern man can vote for him.

MR. FILLMORE'S BUFFALO LETTER.

The Chronicle at last ventures to publish Mr. Fillmore's letter to the Chairman of "The Anti-Slavery Society of the County of Erie," and follows it with a long apologetic rignarole. It won't do, Mr. Chronicle. All the time in "Thomaston and vicinity," wouldn't whitewash the black Abolitionism out of "your own Fillmore." The Chronicle first quotes two sentences from Gen. Cass's pamphlet on the Right of Search as a set off. We have noticed this elsewhere. Then the Chronicle says that Mr. Fillmore voted for the following "resolution on the 11th of December, 1838, (shortly after he wrote the Abolition letter):—

"Resolved, That this Government is a Government of limited power, and that, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the institution of slavery in the several States of the confederacy."

The Abolition members of the House voted AGAINST it. This is the first of the celebrated Atherton Resolutions. But why did not the Chronicle go on to state that on the same and subsequent days, he voted against all the other Resolutions of this series that declared explicitly the rights of the South. But to show how far Mr. Fillmore's voting for this Resolution clears his skirts of Abolitionism, we will quote for the Chronicle's and the reader's benefit, one of the series of Resolutions adopted at the Buffalo Convention, of which Joshua R. Giddings, John P. Hale, Charles Francis Adams, and other notorious Abolitionists, were the chief movers and doers, and ask that paper and the reader if its language is not quite as satisfactory to the South as the above Resolution, for voting for which the Chronicle gives Mr. Fillmore so much credit. Here is the Buffalo Resolution, as voted for and adopted by the most notorious Abolitionists in the land:

"Resolved, That Slavery in the several States of this Union which recognize its existence, depends upon State laws alone, which cannot be repealed or modified by the federal government, and for which laws that Government is not responsible. We therefore, propose no interference by Congress with slavery within the limits of any State."

Is it not fully as satisfactory to the South as the one for which Mr. Fillmore voted?—So you haven't taken much by this motion, Mr. Chronicle. But the Chronicle says that Mr. Fillmore, whilst Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in 1842, reported a bill in favor of claimants whose slaves had been cast away on the Bahamas, and there libelous by the British authorities, but for whom the British Government paid the value. This is true. But it is also true that Joshua R. Giddings spoke in favor of and voted for the bill, shewing that even in this act Giddings and Fillmore were not separated. We think you don't take much by this motion either, Mr. Chronicle.

You may talk to doomsday, but you can't wipe out the Abolitionism of THAT LETTER.

NORTHERN WHIGGERY AND ABOLITIONISM.

We have repeatedly heretofore said, and we think, proved too, to the mind of every unprejudiced man, that the Northern Whigs, as a party, have all their sympathies with and for the Abolitionists. We have shown that there is not a single Whig member of either House of Congress who is not an avowed Wilmot Proviso man—that there is not a single Northern Whig politician, who is figuring in the present canvass, who is not going it strong for the Wilmot Proviso and against the extension of slavery in any direction, or by any means, and that there is not a Taylor paper that we know of, published in all the free States, that is not, openly and above-board, the advocate of the doctrines of the Wilmot Proviso. Whilst on the other hand, we can point to numbers of the most distinguished men in the ranks of the Northern Democracy, who have avowed themselves most unequivocally against the injustice and unconstitutionality of any attempt upon the part of Congress to cheat the South out of her rights in the newly acquired territories.

There are few readers, we presume, who are not familiar with the character of the New York Tribune newspaper, and its Editor, Horace Greeley. The Tribune has been long known as one of the ablest and most influential Whig presses in all the Northern States, at the same time that its Abolition was equally well known. Well, when the Philadelphia Convention nominated General Taylor, and slaughtered the Whig principles and Henry Clay, as the Tribune said, at the same time, that paper kept a neutrality until it found it could not get its favorite, Henry Clay, into the field, when at last it comes out for Gen. Taylor as the choice of two evils; the evils being Taylor and Cass.

The editorial in which it explains its reasons for making this choice, is truly a rich document, and we wish that our limits would permit us to give it to our readers at length. We give an extract, in which the Editor gives his main reason for supporting Taylor, which is, that he (Taylor) is safer for the North on the slavery question than his opponent, General Cass. We wish every Whig in North Carolina would read this extract from the Tribune, and see with what kind of Abolition tail he is laboring, when pulling in the same traces with Northern Whiggery. The Tribune, it will be seen, admits that the Southern Democrats are correct in their calculations of being sustained by the Northern Democracy on the slavery question. The Tribune says:—

"The question of Slavery Extension is the most furious that remains. We know Gen. Cass to be wrong upon it; we do not believe Gen. Taylor to be essentially right. That he has spoken often in general condemnation of Slavery, we are quite aware."

"But how are we to act on this question with a view to ultimate and complete triumph? If the action of our friends could not remove our doubts, and Texas obviously would, South Carolina would, and California would, Gen. Taylor would ally to Gen. Cass; but their instinct teaches them their holder leaders avow, that their only hope of triumph is through the continued ascendancy of their 'natural allies,' the Northern false pretenders to Democracy. And they are not mistaken. The Whig party, faulty as it is, embodies most of the temperate and honest Anti-Slavery sentiment of the country; and the fact that it has nominated a Louisiana Sugar Planter for President, whose opinions on this subject do not accord with its own preponderating convictions, constrains and will constrain it to more decisive and earnest hostilities to slavery extension. The strong current of popular feeling often carries forward those who under other auspices would be found unwilling and even resisting. And a Congress elected under the influence of this feeling will not, dare not, consent to connive at the extension of slavery, whether directly or obliquely. The triumph of the Whigs will be the defeat of the Slavery crusade. From Mr. Cass, the Standard and the *Podium* should Gen. Taylor attempt to overrule or circumvent the Free Soil sentiment, he will soon find himself a second John Tyler. But he has too much sense to attempt it."

MR. FILLMORE'S BUFFALO LETTER.

The Chronicle at last ventures to publish Mr. Fillmore's letter to the Chairman of "The Anti-Slavery Society of the County of Erie," and follows it with a long apologetic rignarole. It won't do, Mr. Chronicle. All the time in "Thomaston and vicinity," wouldn't whitewash the black Abolitionism out of "your own Fillmore." The Chronicle first quotes two sentences from Gen. Cass's pamphlet on the Right of Search as a set off. We have noticed this elsewhere. Then the Chronicle says that Mr. Fillmore voted for the following "resolution on the 11th of December, 1838, (shortly after he wrote the Abolition letter):—

"Resolved, That this Government is a Government of limited power, and that, by the Constitution of the United States, Congress has no jurisdiction whatever over the institution of slavery in the several States of the confederacy."

The Abolition members of the House voted AGAINST it.

This is the first of the celebrated Atherton Resolutions. But why did not the Chronicle go on to state that on the same and subsequent days, he voted against all the other Resolutions of this series that declared explicitly the rights of the South. But to show how far Mr. Fillmore's voting for this Resolution clears his skirts of Abolitionism, we will quote for the Chronicle's and the reader's benefit, one of the series of Resolutions adopted at the Buffalo Convention, of which Joshua R. Giddings, John P. Hale, Charles Francis Adams, and other notorious Abolitionists, were the chief movers and doers, and ask that paper and the reader if its language is not quite as satisfactory to the South as the above Resolution, for voting for which the Chronicle gives Mr. Fillmore so much credit. Here is the Buffalo Resolution, as voted for and adopted by the most notorious Abolitionists in the land:

"Resolved, That Slavery in the several States of this Union which recognize its existence, depends upon State laws alone, which cannot be repealed or modified by the federal government, and for which laws that Government is not responsible. We therefore, propose no interference by Congress with slavery within the limits of any State."

Is it not fully as satisfactory to the South as the one for which Mr. Fillmore voted?—So you haven't taken much by this motion, Mr. Chronicle. But the Chronicle says that Mr. Fillmore, whilst Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in 1842, reported a bill in favor of claimants whose slaves had been cast away on the Bahamas, and there libelous by the British authorities, but for whom the British Government paid the value. This is true. But it is also true that Joshua R. Giddings spoke in favor of and voted for the bill, shewing that even in this act Giddings and Fillmore were not separated. We think you don't take much by this motion either, Mr. Chronicle.

You may talk to doomsday, but you can't wipe out the Abolitionism of THAT LETTER.

NORTHERN WHIGGERY AND ABOLITIONISM.

We